DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 007 CS 502 709

AUTHOR Foss, Karen A.
TITLE The Rhetoric cf Betty Friedan: Rhetcric of Redefinition.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 33p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis: *Feminism: *Language Usage: *Persuasive Discourse: *Rhetoric: *Rhetorical Criticism: Role Perception: *Sex Role; Social Influences: Speech Communication: Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *Friedan (Betty)

ABSTRACT

Two speeches by Betty Friedan, author of "The Feminine Mystique" and first president of the National Organization for Women (NOW), are examined in this paper. The first speech analyzed, "Tokenism and the Pseudc-Radical Cop-Out," was delivered at Cornell University in January, 1969, and the second, a "Call to Women's Strike for Equality," was delivered at the NOW convention in Chicago on March 20, 1970. The first speech was selected for examination because it presents the core ideas cf Friedan's views on feminism and the second speech was selected because of its impact on the women's movement. The purpose, context and audience, symbolic strategies, and effects of Friedan's discourse are analyzed as an initial step toward discovering whether a separate genre of women's rhetoric exists. Friedan's use of symbolic redefinition of women's roles is also noted. (MKM)

ED180007

THE RHETORIC OF BETTY FRIEDAN: RHETORIC OF REDEFINITION

By

Karen A. Foss
Humboldt State University
Arcata, California

Presented to the SCA Annual Convention
San Antonio, Texas
November 11, 1979

CS502709

THE DISCOURSE OF BETTY FRIEDAN:
RHETORIC OF REDEFINITION

> My definition of feminism is simply that women are people, in the fullest sense of the word, . . . It seems to me that <u>all</u> the women's movement ever was, or needs to be, is a stage in the whole human rights movement--bringing another group, a majority this time, into the mainstream of human society.[1]

This excerpt from It Changed My Life is a definition of feminism by Betty Friedan, a woman whose name is almost synonymous with the contemporary women's movement. Friedan's name became a household word in 1963 with the publication of her first book, The Feminine Mystique. This work, often called the book that ignited women's liberation, documented the growing dissatisfaction of American women with the housewife role.

Since 1963, Friedan's involvement in and commitment to the Women's Movement has been all-consuming and a tribute to her tremendous energies. In 1966, she founded and served as first president of the National Organization for Women, a group dedicated to "bringing women into full participation in the mainstream of American society now."[2] In addition, the Women's Strike of August, 1970, which saw 50,000 women and men march down New York's Fifth Avenue to demonstrate their support for women's equality, was Friedan's brain child and the result of her organizational efforts. Friedan also was instrumental in the formation of the National Women's Political Caucus, a Feminist Think Tank, a Women's bank, and another women's organization called Womansurge. Her second book, It Changed My Life, chronicles her journey through the women's movement, and it is from this book that the two speeches I will examine in this paper are taken.

The first speech, "Tokenism and the Pseudo-Radical Cop-Out," was delivered at Cornell University in January, 1969. The second, a "Call to Women's Strike for Equality," was delivered at the national NOW convention in Chicago on March 20, 1970. The first speech was selected because it presents the core ideas of Friedan's views on feminism. The "Call to Strike" speech, while presenting some of these same ideas, was chosen primarily because of its impact; the strike which Friedan proposed in this speech was so successful that it has been called the event which signaled the coming of age of the women's movement. I will examine the purpose, context and audience, symbolic strategies, and effects of Friedan's discourse in this paper as an initial step toward discovering whether a separate genre of women's rhetoric exists.

Purpose

In both of these speeches, Friedan is concerned primarily with clarifying and refocusing the goals of the women's movement and providing it with a sense of direction. Friedan obviously fears that current misconceptions about the movement, its goals, and its participants must be reversed in order for feminism to continue as an effective source of social change. The first sentence in the "Tokenism" speech makes her purpose explicit: "All of us have been thinking about revolutions in this post-industrial era--how they are in danger of being aborted by Establishments, the traps we can fall into."[3] These same concerns about the revolution are evident in the second speech, too, but her focus there is on the need for individual responsibility in order to sustain it: "It is our responsibility to history, to ourselves, to all who come after us, to use this power <u>now</u>, in our own lives, in the mainstream of our society."[4]

A second purpose of Friedan's discourse is to unify the audience and to activate them to work on behalf of feminism. Friedan continually points out the radical and far-reaching effects which are possible when a large segment of the population initiates constructive change: "Our movement is so radical a force for change that as we make our voices heard, . . . we will inevitably create a new political force with allies and a common humanistic frontier" (p. 193, "Strike"). Certain phrases, too, invite immediate audience involvement with the movement: "All of us this past year have learned in our gut that sisterhood is powerful. The awesome power of women united is visible now and is being taken seriously, as all of us who define ourselves as people now take action in every city and state, and together make our voices heard" (p. 192, "Strike"). For Friedan, feminism is the crux of all other revolutions and thus deserves immediate and serious attention, rather than lip-service and tokenism: "If you don't have the sex role debate you could have socialism and women would still be playing a menial role" (p. 164, "Tokenism"). The movement's importance is reinforced with statements such as "There is an urgency in this moment" (p. 192, "Strike"), as she contrasts feminism's potential with society's current status quo. By praising past efforts, encouraging the movement's potential, and stressing the need for immediate action, Friedan begins to create a sense of identification and commitment within her audiences.

Finally, these discourses are designed to gain audience acceptance of moderation as the most effective tactic of the feminist movement. Friedan has provided the movement with one of its most comprehensive and consistent articulations of the philosophy of moderation, and as a result, this point of view has a great deal of credibility. Friedan's advocacy of moderation, however, does not mean that she is conservative in her thinking or that she does not demand fundamental changes in society. Indeed, Friedan undoubtedly would agree with Campbell that a movement which demands consideration of and changes in the basic values of masculinity and femininity cannot be anything but radical.[5] But by espousing a position between extremes, Friedan hopes to balance the movement's tangents and deviations and to appeal to a wide segment of the population.

Friedan's purpose, then, is threefold. First, she seeks to provide audiences with accurate information about the movement and to offer advice to its participants. She also aims to inspire unity, for she continually reminds her audiences of the enormous power and potential available to women once they unite. And finally, these discourses justify and reinforce Friedan's world view of moderation as the most effective approach to feminism.

Context and Audience

Before examining the particular audiences to which Friedan spoke, it is useful to look at the social milieu in which these speeches were given. The late 1960s were characterized by unrest, with involvement in Vietnam at once a catalyst for change as well as the symbol for the uneasiness already present in American society. Although this unrest seemed most apparent among the young, their questioning of basic values was far-reaching and would spread to all classes, institutions, and age levels in the decade to come. The refusal to buy into the status quo was at the heart of the revolution, producing extremes in dress, music, and lifestyle, as well as a new brand of political idealism. The generation that came of age in the 60s was, in every way, a generation out to change the world.

The rebirth of feminism seems, on the surface, a logical extension of these new attitudes, but in fact, it emerged partly in response to the disparity between the ideals and the realities of the 60s. At the same time that Betty Friedan was organizing the National Organization for Women and attracting thousands of middle-class, middle-aged women to a new movement for women's equality, feminist activity also was beginning among younger, more radical women. Numerous women involved in the civil rights movement and New Left politics found themselves, even in this context of movements for radical social change, expected to play conventional subordinate roles. When these women attempted to raise the question of women's role in the movement, they were greeted with hostility and outrage from the movement men. The adoption of a Women's Manifesto at the national conference of the Students for a Democratic Society in the summer of 1967 signaled some recognition of their demands and spurred the development of a proliferation of New Left-related groups dealing with women's issues. Despite the lack of a unified organizational structure and acknowledged leadership, these groups became a sizable force in the new feminism by the early 1970s. They tended to concentrate on consciousness-raising, believing that once personal priorities were clear, that they could be translated into political action. These groups formed the radical branch of the movement, while moderate groups such as NOW, which worked through traditional social and political channels, comprised the more reformist branch, oriented toward women's rights.

At the time of these two speeches, then, both the moderate and radical strands of feminism were established and were actively promoting the cause of women, although there was little cooperation between the two and little public acknowledgment of either. The first evidence of a national and somewhat cohesive movement came with press coverage of a protest at the Miss America Pageant on September 7, 1968.[6] Not only did women from all over the country join in the protest, but the press coverage the demonstration received forced the American public to recognize the existence of a women's movement.

The process of the movement's legitimization began in earnest following Friedan's "Call to Strike" speech; the massive turnout for and response to the Strike forced the press to begin dealing seriously with the women's movement as a significant force for social change.[7] In addition, the first issue of Ms. magazine, a highly commercial, national feminist publication appeared in January, 1971, providing evidence of a substantial public for feminist views. The Equal Rights Amendment--a major goal of the movement--passed the House of Representatives in August, 1971, to be followed by Senate passage in March, 1972. This cluster of events suggests that by 1971, feminism had entered a stable, if not institutionalized phase and was accepted as a legitimate movement. The Friedan speeches examined here are representative, then, of the stage of the movement just prior to its initial breakthrough onto the social-political scene.

Friedan is able to meet this social-political climate and to achieve her speech purposes in part because of her ability to appeal to several audiences at once. Three audiences emerge in each speech--the immediate audience, the participants in the women's movement, and society at large.

In the speech "Tokenism and the Pseudo-Radical Cop-Out," Friedan is addressing a group of students and professors at Cornell University.[8] This speech was given while Friedan was helping Sheila Tobias plan the first Women's Studies Program in the country--an Intersession on Women--at Cornell in January, 1969. Friedan and Tobias encountered opposition from academic men, from ~~New Left~~ men, and from conservative academic women. This speech, then, was geared to contrast the extremes of thought they encountered in the process of establishing this inter-session with what they viewed as the sensibility and logic of a moderate approach.

Despite the deliberate attempt to make the women's movement palatable to all of these groups, this speech received considerable opposition. Friedan tells of a particularly vocal and hostile SDS leader who accosted her at the end of the speech. He disagreed with her use of the term "revolution" to talk about women; according to him, revolution had to do with socialism and the masses, not with women. He feared that if women listened to Friedan, the real revolution would suffer.[9] At the time this speech was given, then, the idea that women needed liberating was still relatively new; women radicals were only beginning to form their own groups apart from the men; and the Women's Studies explosion that would invade virtually every campus in the next decade was at that point only one series of courses offered in an intersession. Thus, Friedan's speech had to balance and integrate the ambivalent but primed climate of the time, the fear and distrust felt by many members of the audience, and the depth of her own commitment.

The immediate audience for the "Strike" speech was very different from that of the speech presented at Cornell. Delivered to the national NOW convention in Chicago in 1970, this speech was received by a favorably disposed and enthusiastic audience. They were not only theoretically committed to the women's movement but were activists as well. In addition, Friedan had founded the group before which she spoke, had served as its president for several years, and was stepping down as NOW's leader at this convention, even though she could have successfully run again.[10] This act undoubtedly increased Friedan's credibility, as well as the audience's desire to listen to her speak and to give special credence to her audiences.

Friedan's effectiveness with both hostile as well as favorable audiences comes in part from appeals that transcend, yet include, the immediate audience. In both of these speeches, Friedan addresses two non-present audiences that are much larger than her immediate ones. One such audience is the women's movement in general. She involves this larger population by the use of the plural "we" and assumes that there already is high involvement on the part of these women. Phrases such as "All of us have been thinking about revolutions," and "Here we are talking about equality. We are exploring how to achieve it" (p. 159, "Tokenism"), convey this assumption of participation. Friedan is deliberately vague about specifying who the "we" entails in an effort to appeal to both the women of the radical Left and the conservative women in academia. By allowing for the participation of both reformist and radical feminists, she not only acknowledges the two branches of the movement but indirectly suggests to the movement that diversity can be beneficial. A variety of groups and formats can reach more women because it allows each to participate in a manner consistent with her values and lifestyle. Thus Friedan broadens her audience by her acceptance of and openness toward the groups in the movement in which she is not personally involved.

In the "Strike" speech, Friedan is speaking almost exclusively to this larger audience--those active in the movement--for these will be the women who can make the strike succeed. She admits, in reflecting back on the speech and on the strike itself, that she was depending on the support of women's groups nationwide and not just on NOW members: "I said it wouldn't, shouldn't be solely a NOW venture; it would only work if launched by a larger coalition."[11] In her discourse, then, Friedan strives to address the entire women's movement, even though her specific audiences may be hostile to her cause. Regardless of commitment, however, she places her particular audience within the structure of the women's movement to show that the movement is relevant to everyone.

In a similar fashion, Friedan appeals to yet another audience through her discourse--she speaks to all members of society. The audience is suggested by, yet goes beyond her other two audiences. Friedan seeks a response from her immediate audience and from the women's movement, but hopes ultimately to reach all men and women in American society, regardless of their current affiliation with or views on feminism. Friedan appeals separately to each sex in this broader audience. Women remain her focus, of course, and she is especially adamant that the movement be relevant to all women: "Any revolutionary theory or theory of women that doesn't include me is by definition wrong because it must spell my name too. . . . It must be applicable to all women . . ." (p. 162, "Tokenism"). Thus she is careful not to exclude those who may not see the revolution as relevant to their lives; she wants the movement to reach all women. And although she sees the revolution as benefiting both sexes, women must assume the primary responsibility for it: "This revolution can have the support of men, but we've got to take the lead in fighting it" (p. 163, "Tokenism").

The inclusion of men in her plans for a revolution enables Friedan to reach the men in her societal audience. She always mentions both women and men in her statements about the ideal future, stresses the benefits for men, and is careful not to alienate men: "So women are going to have to organize . . . not to destroy or fight or kill men or even take the power away from men, but to create institutions that will make possible a real life of equality between the sexes" (p. 162, "Tokenism"). She continually argues that man is not the enemy: "Men are fellow victims; our is a two-sex revolution" (p. 193, "Strike"). And she appeals directly to men to see the parallels between women's lives and their own, using a comparison with which men readily can identify: "It is as much discrimination against women not to give them a maternity leave as it would be unconscionable to make a boy lose his chance to get back into graduate school if he has to go into military service" (pp. 164-65, "Tokenism").

Friedan is more cautious about men's participation in the "Strike" speech, due in part to her belief that women must ultimately command the movement and to the obvious fact that a woman's strike must focus on women. Thus, she invites men to participate in the strike, but on women's terms: "If men want to join us, fine. If politicians . . . wish to discuss our demands, fine, but we will define the terms of the dialogue" (p. 194, "Strike"). By including men as well as women in her vision of society, then, Friedan hopes to encourage the participation of both sexes in the women's revolution. At the same time, she is careful to advocate that women assume and keep control of the movement's direction, thus appeasing those feminists who might be disgruntled about, intimidated by, or even hostile toward the participation of men.

Friedan also appeals to both men and women in society at large by acknowledging and criticizing the extremist factions within the women's movement that not only alienate many women and men, but which may bring about the movement's downfall:

> . . . if we say that love and sex and men and even children are the enemy, not only do we doom ourselves to lives less rich and human, but we doom our movement to political sterility. For we will not be able to mobilize the power of that great majority of women who may have been oversold on love as the end of life, but nevertheless have a right to love; who may be overdefined as sex objects, but nevertheless cannot be asked to suppress their sexuality. (p. 193, "Strike")

She believes that the movement's anti-male stance is pathological and unrealistic:

> It is a fantasy deviation from a really revolutionary approach to say that . . . in order for women to be free they must have a manless revolution and down with men. . . . It is just silly to say that a woman who shoots a man is a heroine to the new feminist because man is the enemy. It's worse than silly--it's a bit sick. (pp. 161-62, "Tokenism")

Friedan, then, attempts to appeal to all women and men and continually returns to the theme that both men and women are human beings and must be considered in any kind of revolution.

In general, then, Friedan's discourse is directed to three major audiences--the immediate one hearing the speech, the women's movement, and all of society. By skillfully integrating these audiences and appealing to those particular factors with which each can best identify, Friedan creates a solid base for the women's movement and its ultimate goal of human liberation.

Symbolic Strategies

Substantive Strategies. Redefinition is the primary strategy in Friedan's discourse and will be the focus of analysis here. The rhetorical device of redefinition is a common strategy and can assume a variety of forms. In a general sense, every time a speaker defines a situation or event for an audience, he or she is essentially redefining it. For my purposes in this paper, however, this strategy will be used in a more narrow sense to mean the deliberate efforts on the part of a speaker to posit a new meaning for a concept, situation, or event in order to provide the audience with a new way of viewing that phenomenon. Redefinition as a strategy seems to appear frequently in the women's movement and is, in fact, the rationale behind consciousness-raising. As women learn that their personal experiences are shared by other women, they begin to see themselves and their lives from a new point of view. Ultimately, they are encouraged to act on this new identity in order to begin to restructure society.[12]

Redefinition allows Friedan to convey an accurate picture of the women's movement and of women as a group. This approach becomes evident almost immediately in the "Tokenism" speech when she refers to the movement as the "sexual revolution." She uses this phrase to mean "the actual relationships between the two sexes" (p. 159, "Tokenism") rather than the popular notion of free love and promiscuity. This reference forces us to define the women's movement as involving men as well as women and to consider the relationship between the sexes as its primary concern. Friedan redefines "sexual revolution" in a broader sense than usual and hopes we will see the women's movement differently as a result.

"Revolution" is another term redefined by Friedan. Whereas many revolutionary demands seem, to outsiders, to be idealistic and impractical, Friedan associates the term "revolution" with practicality: "We have to deal with the world of reality if we are going to have a real revolution" (p. 162, "Tokenism"). Another new twist she gives to the word "revolution" is that it must benefit all people. Usually, we think of revolutions as benefiting a particular group or class at the expense of another. According to Friedan's definition, however, the women's movement "must be applicable to all." She elaborates on this idea when she says: "I do not accept a revolution that will make me a special class of person and say that 85 percent of other women are going to be in a drone class. Any theory that we accept must be applicable to the 15 percent as well as the 85 percent" (p. 162, "Tokenism"). This redefinition effectively suggests that the movement caters not only to radical women but to the most traditional women such as housewives. To illustrate her point, Friedan selects one of the most conservative groups of women in society--nuns--which we would not ordinarily think of as interested in the women's movement: "It [the revolution] must be applicable to all women--even the nuns who are leaving the nunneries--and it must take the realities of sex into account" (p. 162, "Tokenism"). By juxtaposing such disparate images as "revolution" and "nuns," Friedan hopes to restructure our notions about the movement and about who will benefit from it.

In a similar vein, Friedan redefines the enemy of the movement. While many outsiders believe that feminists hate men, Friedan argues that the enemy is not men, but all forms of oppression: "I have said from the beginning that the enemy is not man or men, . . . Men are fellow victims;

ours is a two-sex revolution" (pp. 192-93, "Strike"). Man is not a devil term for her, while oppression is: "If we confront the real conditions that oppress men now as well as women and translate our rage into action, then, and only then will sex really be liberated . . . for women and for men, when we are both really free to be all we can be" (p. 193, "Strike"). She attacks the man-hating segment of the movement and the corresponding myth that all feminists are anti-male by calling this approach counter productive to the revolution:

> it is a fantasy deviation from a really revolutionary approach to say that we want a world in which there will be no sex, no marriage, that in order for women to be free they must have a manless revolution . . . We have to deal with the world of reality if we are going to have a real revolution. (pp. 161-62, "Tokenism")

Thus Friedan minimizes the man-hating perspective, considering it the diversionary tactic of a few. Redefinition allows her to transcend the notion that the movement will benefit only women; it becomes instead a movement for human liberation from all forms of oppression.

The final way in which Friedan redefines an aspect of the movement is in terms of its importance. Typically, the women's movement is considered trivial in comparison to other reform movements. In the "Tokenism" speech, Friedan uses Sweden as an example of a culture in which the issues addressed by the movement are considered central: "The sex role debate is not considered a woman question, not even an individual woman question or a societal woman question, but a sex-role question for men and women alike" (p. 164, "Tokenism"). She returns to this notion when she adds: "If you don't have the sex-role debate you could have socialism and women would still be playing a menial role" (p. 164, "Tokenism"). Much of the effectiveness of this redefinitional strategy undoubtedly is due to American feelings of superiority; by describing a country in which the sex-role issues have been resolved in a short period of time, Friedan shows that America's chauvinism is, in this case, unwarranted. Friedan also conveys the movement's significance by comparing it with other social reform movements that are taken seriously and showing the similarities between them. In the "Tokenism" speech alone, she makes three comparisons between the women's movement and the black civil rights movement. In each instance she hopes to build the movement's credibility through association with a well-accepted reform movement.

In addition to informing her audiences about the movement and supplying new perspectives on it, Friedan also uses redefinition to bring to a conscious level degrading and limiting attitudes about women. The first belief she attacks is that men and women have different world spheres: "One should simply say by definition that both men and women have inner space, and both men and women--as human beings in American society, or in any society in 1969--must move into outer space" (p. 159, "Tokenism"). She obviously means for her audience to think in terms of rockets, satellites, and moon landings, as well as all other roles and responsibilities, as open to women as well as to men: "Whether we are talking about the race to space or the problems of American society, these problems are being decided out there, in society. So for men and women outer space is a must" (p. 160, "Tokenism"). With a reference to the generally-valued space age, Friedan has introduced a not-so-common notion that women belong in our decision-making positions as well as in our rockets to the moon. She has violated the assumption that "women's place is in the home" by coupling it with an image as far-removed from the confines of a house as possible--

the world of space. This image is effective because it uses two extremes to force the audience to examine the role boundaries they personally set for the sexes.

Friedan also introduces more specific examples in the "Tokenism" speech to further her redefinition of women's roles. First, she questions women's primary responsibility for child-rearing. She acknowledges women's primary role in reproduction when she says: "women do give birth to children" (p. 163, "Tokenism"). But she asks her audience to separate the bearing from the rearing of children: "But we must challenge the idea that it is woman's primary role to rear children" (p. 163, "Tokenism"). She suggests that men and society can contribute to this function: "Now, and equally, man and society have to be educated to accept their responsibility for that role" (p. 163, "Tokenism"). Friedan, then, broadens the definition of women's roles by introducing the idea that capability for child-bearing is not a prerequisite for raising a child. She has wrenched apart a common role ascribed to women and in the process has expanded both the male and female spheres.

Another traditional woman's role subject to Friedan's redefinitional process is the assumption that cooking is women's work. In discussing Sweden's integration of male and female roles, Friedan singles out this household chore: "the kitchens are very important--a boy will boast how good a cook he is, and the idea that this is woman's work is gone" (p. 164, "Tokenism"). By denying the rigid division of labor traditionally assumed for the sexes, Friedan suggests that such divisions are not biologically-based absolutes. She redefines women's roles and consequently forces a reexamination of men's roles as well.

Friedan returns to the image of outer space when introducing another assumption about women--the notion that women are less than, or other than human. This assumption is rarely stated although it continues, according to Friedan, to govern our treatment of the sexes. Thus she confronts this attitude by attempting to redefine women as people: "But let's at least start with the assumption that men and women are human. Women are female but they are not cows. There is only one place you can be people and that is in outer society, in human society" (p. 160, "Tokenism"). Friedan raises to a conscious level the belief that femaleness is an inferior characteristic, often equated with animals rather than with humans. The juxtaposition of these three images--human, female, and cow--not only points out the place usually accorded women on such a continuum, but forces the audience to examine humanness generally.

The suggestion that women are not treated as people is mentioned as well in the "Strike" speech: "all of us who define ourselves as people now take action in every city and state" (p. 192, "Strike"). Friedan's belief that women themselves must take the responsibility for this redefinitional process is evident in this example, too. For Friedan, then, the idea that women are not fully human is an unconscious ideology which she hopes the members of her audience will begin to redefine for themselves.

The final notion that Friedan attempts to redefine is women's power. Traditionally, women have been viewed as the weaker sex, possessing little power in either the home or the outside world. The focus of the "Strike" speech is on the need for women to accept and use power. This part of the redefinitional strategy is directed as much to the women in the movement as to outsiders. The first example that juxtaposes women's traditional weakness and political impotence with a growing sense of power comes in the first paragraph of the "Strike" speech: "All of us this past year have learned in our gut that sisterhood is powerful. The awesome power of women united is visible now and is being taken seriously" (p. 192, "Strike"). The phrase "sisterhood is powerful" was an early slogan of the movement and thus was not necessarily new to this audience. Its impact lies not in its novelty, however, but in its oxymoronic qualities. Historically, women have not acted together to build or use power of any sort; indeed, women have tended to separate themselves from other women.[13] Thus, to state that "sisterhood" is "powerful" defines women not only collectively--which is unusual in itself--but as a group capable of taking positive and significant action in society. The phrase "learned in our gut" provides yet another image not generally associated with women. "Gut" is out of place beside the traditional view that, as the more refined and moral sex, women abhor crude or graphic language. The introduction to this speech, then, destroys the notion of women as the weaker and softer sex and begins positing a new image of power for women.

The strategy of redefinition, then, is effectively used by Friedan to accomplish her speaking purposes. Most obviously, redefinition allows her to present a new understanding of the women's movement. By providing common definitions, this strategy also helps unify her audiences--the second purpose of her discourse. And the appeals to human values that pervade all of her redefinitions reinforce her third goal--to present moderation as the most effective stance for the movement to take.

Structural Features. The organization of a discourse can enhance the substance of that discourse, and this is the case with Friedan's speeches.[14] In the "Tokenism" speech, Friedan begins by redefining the women's movement as well as attitudes about women and women's own self-concepts. These new definitions become the foundation for the remainder of her speech, which deals with the various ideological problems of the movement--self-pity, abstraction, extremism, and unrealistic goals. The need for broad-based participation by both men and women is the focus of the next section, while in her conclusion, she compares Sweden and the United States to suggest the kinds of concrete changes that could be made in our society. Her final plea is addressed to her specific audience--students and educators--and the changes they can begin to make in academia.

The "Strike" speech also begins with a reference to the women's movement. This time, however, she is addressing an already-committed audience and seeks to inspire them to continue their efforts and especially to work to make the strike a success. She recognizes, though only briefly, the movement's problems and moves quickly to focus on the movement's potential by reminding women of the collective power they now command. In contrast to the "Tokenism" speech, Friedan deals next with the need to include both men and women in the revolution before turning to a particular problem. The focus she selects cannot be separated from her appeal for widespread participation: she argues that oppression in all forms must be confronted if liberation is to be achieved. She moves then to her call for action, where she outlines her ideas for the women's strike.

Friedan, then, uses a similar organizational pattern in both speeches. Her introductions make reference to the women's movement and focus on redefining it in some fashion for her audience. In the body of the speeches, she presents and discusses a particular problem or issue addressed by the women's movement and also argues for the participation of both women and men in the movement. To conclude, she suggests specific ways to resolve the problem which she has outlined in the body of the speech.

This organizational pattern advances her substantive strategies in several ways. By beginning with a general treatment of the movement, Friedan's discourse not only redefines the movement and women but creates a common base of understanding for her audiences. With neutral or hostile audiences, this foundation is created by disposing of mistaken ideas about the movement. For committed audiences, the creation of a shared set of beliefs is a unifying tactic, achieved by minimizing doubts and problems and celebrating instead the capabilities of the movement's participants. Thus her purposes of redefinition and unification both operate in the introductions to her speeches.

The focus on a particular problem in the body of her speeches allows her audiences to specifically use the new definitions Friedan has given them. This immediate application makes it more likely that the audience members will be able to remember and similarly apply these ideas to situations outside of the speech setting. That the body of both speeches includes the theme that both men and women must participate in the movement suggests the importance of this concept to all of Friedan's purposes--redefinition, unification, and moderation. The perspective of human liberation epitomizes clearly all of these purposes, which accounts for its predominance in her discourse.

Finally, the specific suggestions for action with which Friedan concludes provide a sense of completeness and resolution for the problem she has posed. The specificity increases the probability of audience action, while the challenge is another unifying device. And with her redefinitions as a shared foundation, her audience is in a much better position to believe in her way of seeing the world and to act to attain that world. Thus structural features increase the credibility of Friedan's arguments; with her organizational pattern, she reiterates and reinforces the strategies and speaking goals evident in the substance of her discourse.

Stylistic Features. Although it is impossible to say that a speaker consciously chooses certain stylistic features to attain certain goals, style is capable of persuasive impact.[15] The way in which Friedan's style reinforces her substantive strategies is in line with this assumption. She uses two stylistic strategies predominantly--antithesis and repetition--to support her speaking purposes of redefinition, unification, and moderation.

The goal of redefinition is served primarily through antithesis. Friedan places contradictory ideas side-by-side to emphasize the disparity between traditional notions and new humanistic ones and between misconceptions and accurate perspectives on the movement. In the "Tokenism" speech, two lengthy instances of antithesis occur: "So women are going to have to organize, . . . not to destroy or fight or kill men or even to take the power away from men, but to create institutions that will make possible a real life of equality between the sexes" (p. 162, "Tokenism"). The series of conjunctions in this example also dramatize the different perspectives and thus heighten the antithesis even more. The second instance of antithesis suggests a continuum of alternatives for dealing with issues of sex: "The sex-role debate is not considered a woman question, not even an individual woman question or a societal woman question, but a sex-role question for men and women alike" (p. 164, "Tokenism"). Again, antithesis allows her to compare alternatives and in the process to emphasize the one which is in line with her redefinitions. Often, the most jarring instances of antithesis occur in the form of oxymorons, and Friedan includes two of these in her discourse--"happy problems" (p. 159, "Tokenism") and "impotent rage" (p. 194, "Strike"). Friedan suggests, in these instances, the severity of the issues confronting women, giving her redefinitions heightened intensity.

Several additional examples of antithesis occur in the "Strike" speech. Most notable is the statement: "Either that energy so long buried . . . will become a powerful force for keeping our whole society human and free, or it will be manipulated in the interests of fascism and death" (p. 194, "Strike"). The use of antithesis, then, allows Friedan to point out the problems with traditional notions about the movement and about women and to present new ways of looking at them.

Antithesis also supports Friedan's appeal to moderation--another purpose of her discourse. By presenting contradictory concepts, she invites her audiences to synthesize the two perspectives into a new, more humanistic one. In other words, by presenting both extremes, she suggests that there may be new sets of values and modes of operating that can enhance and benefit both sexes. Her goal of moderation also is reflected in her language. She does not shock her audiences by using inappr opriate or obscene language of any sort. She chooses instead to use positive statements which simultaneously convey respect for her audiences. Thus moderation is a substantive goal that Friedan reinforces stylistically as well.

Repetition is one way to emphasize certain concepts and ideas, and Friedan uses this tactic to further her final purpose--the unification of her audiences. Anaphora and alliteration are two figures of speech which rely for affect on repetition and which occur in Friedan's discourse. Anaphora is the repetition of the same word or words at the beginning of successive clauses and is found frequently in the "Tokenism" speech. The following phrases are examples: "both men and women have inner space, and both men and women . . . must move into outer space" (p. 159, "Tokenism"); In the elementary schools boys and girls take cooking and child care, and boys and girls take shop. Boys and girls take higher mathematics" (p. 164, "Tokenism"); and "if we expected that all men were the enemy, all men were the oppressor" (p. 163, "Tokenism"). In the first two references, repetition gives special emphasis to Friedan's philosophy of equal treatment of the sexes. This is a unifying appeal for it invites the audience to focus on the similarities between the sexes rather than on the differences. The repetition of "all men," on the other hand, reinforces Friedan's position that men are fellow victims; again this is a tactic designed to appeal to a large audience because it does not alienate or blame any particular group for the current status quo.

Several instances of anaphora also occur in the "Strike" speech. The repetition of "we doom," for example, reiterates the notion that the movement will not succeed if it alienates particular groups. Anaphora, then, is a tactic which bolsters the unity Friedan attempts to achieve substantively in her discourse.

Alliteration is another scheme of repetition which enhances the unifying process. The phrase "tinkering and tokenism" (p. 164, "Tokenism") summarizes the speech's focus in a quick, easy-to-remember fashion and serves as a rallying point for audience members. Similarly in the "Strike" speech, the phrase "repression and recession" (p. 192, "Strike") provides a common viewpoint for the audience thus encouraging group identification and unity. Finally, the use of "we" throughout promotes a group spirit, as well as creating a sense of action and involvement.

Substantive and stylistic features interact in Friedan's discourse to create a very personal tone. She speaks as one human being to another without pretense and without talking down to her audiences. With appeals to moderation and unity based on humanistic definitions, she shows respect and openness toward her audiences and does not condemn their views, life-styles, or degrees of commitment to feminism. She exemplifies, in a sense, the new forms of equality, responsibility, and power which she advocates. Her style also is infused with credibility, which is enhanced by her personableness. For depite her position of reknown within the women's movement, she remains a caring human being who has herself confronted the issues she hopes her audiences will address. Friedan's tone, then, is warm, respecting, open, and friendly. It is well suited to her ideas and promotes the achievement of her speaking goals.

Effects of the Discourse

The immediate and long-term reactions to and effects of these speeches cannot, of course, be absolutely determined. Friedan's reflections about the speeches and the resulting directions of the movement are two sources of information about their immediate effectiveness. The "Strike" speech was well received by the convention delegates, although NOW officers were more cautious: "The NOW members had gasped and cheered at the idea of the strike. But the next morning, at the board meeting of NOW at the convention close, Aileen Hernandez and some others opposed wasting NOW's resources on such a wild scheme."[16] Once Friedan agreed to assume responsibility for the strike, its nation-wide appeal became obvious. She tells of the actions taking place in conjunction with the strike day:

> "This ad insults women" medals. . . . a putting up of mock statues of ignored women of history at various places in the city . . . a huge banner "Women of the World Unite" smuggled over by boat and draped on the Statue of Liberty. Elsewhere, bulletins were coming in: the women in a Louisiana newspaper put the men's pictures in the engagement and marriage society news that day . . . Women at a beach resort had their husbands bake cakes for a strike-money cake sale. As a result of all the foreign coverage, Dutch women marched on the U.S. embassy in Amsterdam to demonstrate their support of their American sisters (elipses hers).17

The parade, too, drew far more women than had been expected--even by Friedan: "And I turned the corner on to the park, and there were more women than anyone had ever seen. The crowd was estimated at 50,000, 35,000--we kept jumping up to look back, and couldn't believe it."[18] This march is singled out as an event which gave the women's movement high press coverage and thus legitimacy. Whereas previously women's events had been neglected, ridiculed, or at least trivialized, this one was too big for anything but respectable coverage. Friedan emphasized the significance of the event in her speech to the assembled marchers at the end of the parade route:

> After tonight, the politics of this nation will never be the same. By our numbers here tonight, by women who marched curb-to-curb down Fifth Avenue--women who had never marched before in their own cause with veterans of the first battle of the vote with young high school students, black women with white women, housewives with women who work in factories and offices, women whose husbands

are rich and who discovered that all women are poor--we learned. We learned what none of us had dared to hope--the power of solidarity, the power of our sisterhood.[19]

The immediate response to the "Tokenism" speech was mixed. It was greeted by hostility from some of the SDS men and by fear mixed with support and enthusiasm from Cornell's women.[20] Yet, the Cornell intersession on Women's Studies survived to become the model for Women's Studies across the country. Thus, Friedan's speech was not without some direct influence.

The ideal of a new, more humanistic society, as described in the "Tokenism" speech has not yet been realized, however. Neither was the optimism expressed in the "Strike" speech an accurate projection of the movement's future. Many basic goals of the movement have not been accomplished; indeed, the movement seems to be at a standstill. The Equal Rights Amendment, for example, still has not been ratified by the thirty-six legislative assemblies necessary to make it law. And although the drive to extend the ratification deadline passed both houses of Congress, many doubt that the three additional ratifications needed can be secured in time. Similarly, the 1973 Supreme Court ruling in favor of legalized abortion is being threatened at both state and federal levels by the extensive lobbying of right-to-life groups. The most serious threat to the movement, however, may be the divisiveness within the movement itself.

This divisiveness was perhaps epitomized by the events at the 1975 national convention of NOW in Philadelphia. Factionalism split the convention, with those demanding concentration on radical issues finally winning out, after all-night voting, stolen registration books, and policing by the American Arbitration Association.[21] Their campaign slogan, "Out of the mainstream, into the revolution," was a direct repudiation of Friedan's moderate stance. Much debate also centered on the issues of structure and leadership, as convention delegates were beseiged with a variety of proposals for alternative, non-hierarchical ways to organize NOW. The factional politics and inefficiencies of the 1975 convention are only representative of the disillusionment with the movement in all areas. As one NOW member described the mood: "The members are in disarray. They're going home. They're tearing up their membership cards."[22] As a result of these events, Friedan and other ex-NOW officers formed a new group called Womansurge to counter the revolutionary drift of NOW and to return to an emphasis on primary feminist issues.[23] The divisiveness within the women's movement, then, remains a problem that will need to be given serious attention in the years to come.

Despite the movement's apparent rejection of Friedan's stance of moderation, she continues in her advocacy of it. She is likely to continue to seek out committed and uncommitted audiences alike, an approach consistent with her belief in all forms of liberation. In the long run, her discourse may well have a greater impact on society than the more radical discourse, for she is consistent in her inclusion of both sexes in the revolution and continues to speak directly to that large segment of the population unable to accept radical interpretations of feminism as appropriate for their lives.

The effectiveness of Friedan's discourse may not really be known until we can determine how the women's movement weathers the crises now confronting it. Undoubtedly, the next decade will tell whether or not the movement survives as a significant force for social change. Regardless of the outcome, though, Betty Friedan's influence on the course of the movement is indisputable, for she has done as much, if not more, than any other contemporary feminist to achieve "human liberation; the next chapter of the human story."[24]

NOTES

[1]Betty Friedan, It Changed My Life (New York: Dell, 1976), p. 317.

[2]Ibid., p. 124.

[3]Betty Friedan, "Tokenism and the Pseudo-Radical Cop-Out," It Changed My Life, p. 159. All further references to this speech appear in text, hereafter cited as "Tokenism."

[4]Friedan, "Call to Women's Strike for Equality," It Changed My Life, p. 192. All further references to this speech appear in text, hereafter cited as "Strike."

[5]Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (February 1973), 74-86. Ann Battle-Sister, in "Conjectures on the Female Culture Question," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (August 1971), 411-21, also discusses the cultural conditions which women must overcome to effect a successful revolution.

[6]Judith Hole and Ellen Levine, Rebirth of Feminism (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1971), p. 123.

[7]See, for example, the New York Times editorial, 28 August 1970, p. 24.

[8]Friedan, It Changed My Life, p. 153.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., p. 189.

[11]Ibid., p. 191.

[12]Louise McPherson, "Communication Techniques of the Women's Liberation Front," Today's Speech, 21 (Spring 1973), 34.

[13]For the historical treatment of this theme by the women's movement, see Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, trans. H. M. Parshley (New York: Bantam; Alfred Knopf, 1952); H. Carleton Marlow and Harrison M. Davis, The American Search for Woman (Santa Barbara: Clio, 1976), esp. pp. 16-105; and Dorothy L. Sayers, Are Women Human? (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1971).

[14]For a discussion of the ways organization can function to enhance substance, see Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 72.

[15]This assumption has been basic to the field of Rhetoric since ancient times. Aristotle observed that a speaker's dianoia or personal style of communication can be as persuasive as the arguments themselves. See Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (April 1970), 110-11. Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argument, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969], pp. 142-43) discuss the inseparableness of style and form, too, in what is essentially a reformulation of the Aristotelian point of view: "We refuse to separate the form of a discourse from its substance, to study stylistic structures and figures independently of the purpose they must achieve in the argumentation." Finally, Marshall McLuhan's "the medium is the message" provides a popularized statement of this stance. See Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, The Medium is the Massage (New York: Bantam Books, 1967), p. 8.

[16]Friedan, It Changed My Life, p. 191.

[17]Ibid., p. 200.

[18]Ibid., p. 201.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 203.

[20]*Ibid.*, pp. 153-54.

[21]*Ibid.*, p. 474.

[22]Ronnie Knuck, "NOW to Push Program for Lesbians," *Eugene Register Guard*, 28 October 1975, sec. A, p. 4.

[23]"Womenswar," *Time*, 1 December 1975, p. 55.

[24]Friedan, *It Changed My Life*, p. 19.